

THE ANTI-CHINESE BILL.

FURTHER DISCUSSION IN THE SENATE.

MR. CHANDLER ON BLAIR'S REJECTION AND MR.

DAVIS ON CAHENSLY'S MEMORIAL.

TO THE POPE.

Washington, April 22.—The Chinese Exclusion Bill was taken up in the Senate to-day, and Mr. Chandler proceeded to present testimony as to the continuous introduction of Chinese from Canada and British Columbia, in order to show the need of more stringent laws to prevent the influx of Chinese over the land border. He favored the seventh section of the House bill providing the penalty of imprisonment in a penitentiary for Chinese so introduced. In the course of his remarks he referred to the Scott Act of October 1, 1888, which was a violation of the treaty with China. The term "violation" did not suit Mr. Chandler, who suggested the use of the term "abrogation" or "repeal" instead of it. Mr. Chandler thought that it made no difference whether the word "abrogation" or the word "violation" was used. In proceeding with his argument, Mr. Chandler said that there was no more difficulty about amending the House bill than there was about agreeing to the substitute reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Davies—Does the Senator mean to say that because we have violated the treaty once we may do so twice?

Mr. Chandler—I think that that is a very fair argument—yes. There is no proposition before the Senate except to violate the treaty.

Mr. Davies—To violate it again?

Mr. Chandler—Yes.

Mr. Davies—And the justification is that we violated it before?

Mr. Chandler—Yes; and there is nothing here that does not propose to violate it again.

In reply to a question by Mr. Hancock, Mr. Chandler said that the Chinese Government had never assented to the partial abrogation of the treaty. It had refused to receive the new minister from the United States and had refused to grant to Congress the right to pass the Scott law.

He went on to say that the Chinese Government was not in a condition to expect the United States to refrain from passing such laws against Chinese immigration as might seem good to Congress. There were only two Senators, he said, who could ever expect to be received by the Chinese Government as Ministers. These were Mr. Sherman and Mr. Butler. He was free to admit that he thought the situation between the American Government and China was a bad one. Reverting to the case of Mr. Blair, he remarked that that Senator was almost the only one who made a vigorous fight in the Senate against the Scott bill.

He went on to read and comment upon the correspondence of the State Department with the Chinese Government and Mr. Denby, on the subject of Mr. Blair's rejection as Minister. He referred particularly with much acerbity of language, to the fact that the dispatch of the State Department of October 10, 1891, explaining and defending the position of Mr. Blair had not been communicated to the Chinese Government, but had been buried in the archives of the State Department.

Mr. Blair had not been communicated to the Chinese Government, but had been buried in the archives of the State Department until Mr. Wharton, by his dispatch of March 23, 1892, directed it to be done forthwith. As bearing upon and explanatory of Mr. Denby's action, Mr. Blair stated that one of the Minister's sons was in the employ of the Chinese Government as a secretary. Mr. Blair stated that he had been told by the Secretary of the Legation, He (Mr. Chandler) did not learn at the State Department whether those facts were or not, although he had inquired; but his information came from Mr. Blair himself.

Mr. Davis, a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, said that in his judgment many momentous things were involved in the question. The entire question of immigration, its equality, its extent and its fearful degradation afforded theme not only a basis for thought, but for profound apprehension. He looked upon the bill as a rank, brutal, unbecoming, unmitigated repudiation of every treaty obligation remaining between the United States and China. Mr. Davis went on to say that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China. He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China. He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China. He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

He then referred to the case of Mr. Blair, who had been rejected as Minister to China. He said that there was no fear of the submergence of 65,000,000 people by the 300,000 Chinese now in the country; and repeated that the Chinese Government was not anxious for its people to come to America, but for the people of America to go to China.

"NOTHING LIKE IT"

WHAT A
LOWELL GROCER
HAS TO SAY OF
AYER's
Sarsaparilla
AS A
SPRING MEDICINE.

LOWELL, MASS.,

Dec. 2, 1891.

"A year ago last spring, my partner and I, the whole burden and responsibility of a large grocery business, fell upon me. The increased care and hard work, in connection with the low state of my blood, from which I had always suffered during the early spring, so severely taxed my strength that I became all run down, had no appetite, was weak, nervous, and endured all the torments which headache, indigestion, general debility, and total loss of energy, could possibly inflict. The medicines recommended me by my physicians did no more good than so much water. AYER'S Sarsaparilla being favorably brought to my attention, I tried it, and, in a short time, began to feel better. I continued to take this medicine for nearly two months, at the end of which time I felt like a new man. My appetite, energy, and strength returned, my food digested perfectly, and all traces of headache and nervousness disappeared. I am convinced that if I had not taken AYER'S Sarsaparilla, instead of being strong and well, when the WARM WEATHER set in, I should have been confined to my bed, under the doctor's care, and totally unable to attend to business. I am a thorough believer in the merits of AYER'S Sarsaparilla for restoring to healthy, vigorous action, the vital organs of the body, when they have become weakened or exhausted from any cause. As a spring medicine, there is nothing like it."

Wm. H. Brown.

Has cured others, will cure you

banded from the Chinese that I could not refrain

from it."

At the close of Mr. Davis's speech, without any action on the Chinese bill, the Senate adjourned until to-morrow.

GENERAL BUSSEY REPEATS THE CHARGES.

THEY ARE STRICKEN FROM THE RECORD OF THE

RAUM INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE.

Washington, April 22.—Assistant Secretary Bussey to-day appeared before the Raam Investigating Committee in response to certain charges made against him by a witness (Dugan) before the committee. The testimony of that witness, he said, had been spread broadcast by the newspapers generally. When he had read the account, he had been made up to him by the telephone to the Treasury Department and asked for the papers filed there when he was an applicant for the office of Collector of the Port of New-Orleans. He had those papers with him now. He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

He had been in business in New-Orleans for 10 years. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business. The failure had been brought about by the failure of the bank of the city, which had failed after having transacted more than \$250,000,000 of business.

bill carried a total appropriation of \$24,200,000, and

as reported to the Senate, the total is \$24,411,400, an

increase of \$211,400. The most important provision

was the exclusion of the clause prohibiting the payment

of money for transportation of troops over non-

bonded lines owned or operated by the Union Pacific

Railroad Company. The committee also struck out

the clause cutting off the salary of adjutants and

insuring an advance upon the salary of adjutants

of the rank of the adjutant. It also struck

out the paragraph assigning the duty of paymasters

to acting paymasters and officers acting as quar-

termasters and commissaries, and fixed the number of

officers of the pay corps at twenty-five instead of

twenty, as fixed by the House. The bill also

increased the salary of the adjutant general from

\$2,000 to \$2,500, and increased the salary of the

adjutant general from \$2,000 to \$2,500, and in-

creased the salary of the adjutant general from \$2,000

to \$2,500, and increased the salary of the adjutant

general from \$2,000 to \$2,500, and increased the

salary of the adjutant general from \$2,000 to \$2,500,

and increased the salary of the adjutant general from

\$2,000 to \$2,500, and increased the salary of the

adjutant general from \$2,000 to \$2,500, and in-

creased the salary of the adjutant general from \$2,000

to \$2,500, and increased the salary of the adjutant

general from \$2,000 to \$2,500, and increased the

salary of the adjutant general from \$2,000 to \$2,500,

and increased the salary of the adjutant general from

\$2,000 to \$2,500, and increased the salary of the

adjutant general from \$2,000 to \$2,500, and in-

creased the salary of the adjutant general from \$2,000

to \$2,500, and increased the salary of the adjutant